Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/147,919	CARDOSA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mary E. Mosher, Ph.D.	1648
All Participants:	Status of Application	·
(1) Mary E. Mosher, Ph.D.	(3)	
(2) Antoinette Konski I).	(4)	
Date of Interview: 1 & 12 July 2004	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	plicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed: none		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GI See Continuation Sheet	ENERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separ directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separ did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sum 	The examiner will provide a ate record of the substance o	written summary of the substance f the interview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Appl	icant/Applicant's Representati	ve Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Is there a claim to benefit of DK 1035/96? Inventor's oath says priority not claimed, but MM can't figure out if a claim is made somewhere else in the file, the file has been imaged & it is difficult to find thiings. Yes, claim was made & acknowledged in earlier Office action. However, on reviewing file records, AK noted that this application was filed without figures, and authorized Exr's amendment to delete the figures and all references to them. Neither AK nor MM understand where the figures in the image file originated, possibly from a priority document.